

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

April 9, 2001

LB 75

long that every senator who votes for such a bad bill is not going to be able to find a way to slither out from under it later by saying, well I didn't know what we were doing. Everybody on this floor knows what this bill is, everybody on this floor knows what it is doing and it is not doing anything that is proper. Some people talk about the laws we pass that are mandatory in nature relative to education. We are charged, under the constitution, to regulate education. There is nothing in the constitution that charges us with destroying competition, driving it off the market. And it is such a petty, parochial point of view that is being adopted here that it's no wonder that people think of Nebraska as a hick place, out of touch with everything, behind the times. And it is. The people will look at one, small sector of the economy. They call this a farm state. There is farming in this state, but telecommunications has more of a future in Nebraska than family farms or middle-size farms, those things are items of the past. What we're doing or being asked to do with this bill is not to bail out farming, it's not going to do that. Senator Connealy, to his credit, has not made that argument; but there are people out there who may think somehow this is designed to benefit farmers. It's designed to benefit a few investors. Now if you bring up a bill to get state money, taxpayer money to build additional ethanol plants for a product that is not selling, that cannot make its way on the market right now, what is going to happen when you get more plants subsidized directly with taxpayer money, producing this product that won't sell? What is "Little" Jon going to say then? Well, he didn't know; he ought to know, as everybody else ought to know. What will you then say? Compel the introduction of ethanol into every fuel that is sold at the pump in this state so that this stuff being sold from these plants subsidized with public money will have a chance to sell a product that cannot make it competing on the market. I feel somewhat strange giving these arguments, because I'm arguing as a capitalist would argue. I'm arguing by analogy as somebody who believes in free trade would argue, somebody who is saying you create markets, you put products out there, you let the rules or principles or forces of supply and demand come into play. If there is a high supply and not much demand, the price goes down, unless you artificially prop up the price, which is what Senator Wehrbein wanted to do. If you have a shabby,